

W19.5  
AM 5  
M6



[Reprinted from Detroit Review of Medicine, March, 1876.]

## HOMEOPATHY IN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY.

### FURTHER FACTS AND OPINIONS.

#### LETTER FROM WEST JOPLIN, MO.

WEST JOPLIN, Jasper Co., Mo., Jan. 30, 1876.

*Editors of the Detroit Review :*

DEAR SIRS—Through the kindness of Dr. W. B. Smith, of Ann Arbor, I received a few days since a copy of your REVIEW for January. I expected to find something in it about the late laboratory troubles, and I hoped that the investigations might prove entire innocence on the part of Professors Douglas and Rose, and that the worst feature would be carelessness in the method of keeping accounts. But to my surprise and sorrow I found, instead of news on that subject, something totally unlooked for, namely, the unconditional surrender of the time-honored and scientific faculty of Michigan to the homeopaths, with one honorable exception, Dr. Sager.

I expect that so much has been said and written that you are perhaps getting tired of the subject. But I will state how I feel as one of that great body of graduates of medicine from Michigan who are stationed out on the frontier, so to speak, of the battle-field that is in the new portions of our country, where quackery and imposition have always found their most genial soil. That this is so is easily shown by the facts that people, constantly moving in and out, are not so well acquainted with each other as in the East, and that there is more superstition on account of want of education and refinement. Until about sixteen months ago there was no bar to anyone practicing here. In March, 1874, an act was passed requiring anyone practicing medicine or surgery in Missouri to register a copy of his or her diploma, or, in lieu of a diploma, to state under oath that he or she had practiced for ten previous to the act in the State, and all must be registered by the following September, or pay a fine of between twenty-five and five hundred dollars for each and every offense. A supplementary act was passed that anyone who was

not in the State at the time of registration, but who came in after the required time, and could take oath that he had practiced ten years before the act in the State, could also be admitted to practice. Well, under this act, we had a miserable old quack arrested, and now have him bound over to appear before the Grand Jury next term. There are several things in our way. In the first place, we cannot get the doctors together in sentiment. It is "every man for himself, and the," etc.

When I came here four years ago to this mining district (camp it was then, now a city of between eight thousand and ten thousand inhabitants), armed with my diploma, filled with enthusiasm awakened and fed by my worthy preceptors, the faculty of Michigan University, I took high ground, and, although I had an uphill time of it for a while, other graduates coming in, two or three of them also from Michigan, we leagued together, and it has brought good results. Our opinions are respected, and our counsels have weight. This action of the faculty makes us feel blue. Why did they not resign, or threaten to do so if the legislature or regents did not alter their action in the shortest time possible? Why, if they had been driven to resign, and had they called upon the alumni of the medical department of Michigan University, not a man of us, I think, but would have given money and moral support to start an independent school, with them for the faculty. I cannot believe that Dr. Palmer (whose work on homeopathy I have before me), that Drs. Ford and Cheever, men I almost looked upon as if they were blood relations, squarely looked this thing in the face. I have always proudly hung up my diploma on my wall, but when Michigan University begins to send homeopaths or any other species of quacks out into the field, I shall feel like turning it to the wall, or hanging it in mourning. But enough of this subject.

I will say that in a radius of over a hundred miles I know of but one homeopath. That tells the story for small doses of nothing in a sickly, malarial climate, and I can swear that he uses as large doses of calomel, quinine and opium as I do; if he did not, he could not practice here a month. Medicine has to be used here; people do not get well here by the inherent power of their own vitality, and some doctor get the credit, but strong medicines, as the people term them, have to be used, and that, too, quickly.

I noticed in your journal three cases of triplets—two in England, one in France. I had a case here in Joplin last August. Mrs. Reed, wife of a real estate agent; both father and mother scrofulous people; both poor in health; had already had five children, all single births. I was called, and delivered one healthy male child. The placenta was detached, and I had trouble to stop bleeding; but I then called in Dr. Abbot, and he manipulated over the abdomen, while I applied the forceps and delivered two more, both breach presentations. The last two were



still-born, and no artificial respiration or other means would bring them to life. The first one lived and did well, also the mother. The children were all three attached to one placenta by three umbilical cords.

About two years ago I had a case of spina bifida where the spinal cord was exposed to view for two inches. There had been a tumor, about as large as my closed hand, on the back, over the lower dorsal and upper lumbar vertebræ. This had burst during delivery. I cut away the superabundant tissue, and dissected all the lining membrane, except the small strip covering and adhering to the meninges of the cord. I closed with suture, and injected persulphate of iron, etc., but found that when I decreased the flow of fluid from the wound, the anterior fontanelle would rise, the eyes become convergent (strabismus), and other symptoms of acute hydrocephalus appear. It lived six weeks.

I have met many interesting cases here, an account of which I should have sent to the journals, but business has been urgent, and I have felt too tired to do any writing, especially on medical subjects.

Yours truly,

CHARLES F. TITUS, M. D.

P. S.—I would sooner give one day's practice every week, or the proceeds thereof, to aid in establishing our old faculty in a school of their own, than see them go down with the old ship dishonored, and dishonoring us who have graduated there.

## LETTER FROM DR. SAGER.

---

ANN ARBOR, February 12, 1876.

*Messrs. Editors of Detroit Review of Medicine and Pharmacy :*

GENTLEMEN—In the February number of the REVIEW we find a broad denial, by Professor Ford, of the correctness of our historical statement, so far as concerns his participation in the action of the faculty, touching the incipient stages of that action, in relation to the introduction of homeopathy into the medical department of the University.

This denial forces upon us the necessity of making a statement more in detail of our own recollections of the record made at the time, as dean of the faculty, and also to furnish corroborative testimony from other reliable sources.

As we stated in a former article, the homeopathic bill introduced into the Senate, as drawn up by Dr. Ellis (homeopath), of Detroit, and generally known as the "Detroit Scheme," contemplated the establishment of a complete homeopathic college, with six professorships, and with a salary of one thousand dollars for each professor; the course of instruction to continue during the usual period of four months. In this form, and with this understanding, it passed the Senate by a nearly unanimous vote on the 13th of April.

This bill was approved and voted for by several of the alumni of the medical department of the University, in the confident expectation that the long-drawn controversy respecting homeopathy would thus be closed, with general satisfaction to the homeopaths, and without injury to the regular school as it then existed.

This bill was reported back to the Senate, by the committee to which it had been referred on the 8th of March. A day or two later, a meeting of the faculty was called at the joint request of Drs. Ford and Douglass. This is admitted by Dr. Ford in his reply. It would seem to be but a fair presumption that they were also agreed as to the special object of the call. The purpose of the meeting was stated by Dr. Douglass to be to ascertain whether the faculty were not willing to make some concession by which the homeopaths might be allowed to acquire the long-sought connection with the University. This proposition, it will be observed, was made to the faculty when the bill then before the Senate contemplated an entirely separate and complete college of homeopathy, and probably to be located at Detroit.



In the discussion of this proposition, Dr. Palmer expressed his surprise and regret that such a proposition should have been brought forward by a member of the faculty, when the homeopaths were greatly discouraged and willing to accept of an appropriation on any other terms.

Dr. Douglass advocated it on the ground that the difficulty of procuring appropriations for the needs of the University would thus be obviated. An adverse report had been made in the House of Representatives, but a few days previously, on the original bill for a school of mines, asking a very large appropriation for that purpose. With a greatly reduced appropriation, it passed the House a few days before the close of the session. Dr. Douglass, it is generally known, has accepted a professorship in the new school of mines.

Dr. Ford took the same position, and asked whether the faculty would allow the University to be ruined, rather than make the required concession. In short, the proposition was negatived by a majority of the faculty, partly on the ground that such a concession would involve a professional immorality—a *malum in se*, and in part because the circumstances called for no concession.

This statement is made from memory, a copy of the record of the faculty having been mislaid. If any error exists, the faculty are requested to correct it by publishing a verbatim copy of the original record, which is in their possession, and not easily accessible to the writer.

In confirmation of these recollections, we quote from a letter by Professor F. H. Gerrish, dated December 3d, 1875, viz:

"I have no recollection of being present at more than one meeting of the faculty at which the homeopathic question was discussed. The exact date of that meeting I am unable to give, but can come very near it. I remember that it was just before the final examination of the medical class (the third week in March), for after we had finished the homeopathic discussion, I was deputed to make out a time-table for the examination. This circumstance is vividly impressed on my mind as being at the close of our meeting, which must have taken place, I think, on the 12th or 13th of March.

"At that meeting, you and Dr. Palmer and I were the principal opponents to the measure proposed. You took the ground you now do. I believe I was with you entirely. Dr. Palmer warmly insisted on the folly of yielding anything to the homeopaths, when they were worse beaten than they ever had been, and had nearly given up the fight. Dr. Douglass wanted to let them in. Drs. Dunster, Maclean and Frothingham expressed no decided opinions, but were not emphatically opposed to the admission of homeopaths on the plan proposed. The president thought the faculty ought to make concessions for the sake of helping the University to large appropriations.

"Dr. Ford expressed an opinion which I remember as being more nearly like that of Dr. Douglass than that of any other. I am quite sure about the various opinions, but cannot give them more definitely."

Several important points are established by this testimony:

1st. That at no other meeting of the faculty during the term was the subject of homeopathy discussed, hence at no other could Dr. Ford have advocated its admission, or opposed it.

2d. This meeting of the faculty, which Dr. Ford admits he did request, was called for the purpose above stated, and Dr. Ford brought forward no other business.

3d. The expressed opinions of Drs. Ford and Douglass, and the president, were in favor of the admission of homeopathy.

From these premises, we think the inference entirely logical and not overstrained, that at the meeting of the faculty with the medical committee of the regents, at which the plan of organization was submitted, Dr. Ford might, with the greatest propriety, be counted "as present in sentiment," and in "entire harmony with its action." But, as admitted in our September review of the faculty statement, Dr. Ford had in all former years stood firmly with the rest of the faculty in opposing the admission of homeopathy; and in 1867, when the regents proposed to establish it under almost identical circumstances, he, in common with nearly every other member of the then existing faculty (the present faculty consisting chiefly of young bloods), had prepared his letter of resignation, and would have tendered it if the plan had been executed. The grave defection, at which some of the faculty were greatly surprised, became known to them first at this meeting.

But, granting that Dr. Ford was absent in person when the Board of Regents enacted the plan of organization, he returned to this city prior to the meeting of the board at which the homeopathic appointments were made; but neither then nor since has he uttered a whisper of dissent, but has given an *unhesitating practical approval* of this act of organization.

He seems since to have discovered that "to approve or reprove the action of the board was no part of his duty." Can it be that his unflinching loyalty and obedience to the mandates of the board were secured by such intimations as Regent Rynd, in his recent letter in the *Philadelphia Times*, says was given to the faculty by the medical committee, that they were not summoned to discuss or interpose objection to the plan of organization, but simply to decide then and there whether they would submissively accept the situation, or step down and out, with the assurance that the regents were prepared to meet any emergency?

Alas, how painful the contrast with the action of the faculty of 1867 (of which but two members remain), when, instead of making a statement after three months' deliberation in the vain effort to serve two masters, they submitted a manly and vigorous protest,



of which the following extract exhibits the general scope and character, viz: "It would destroy the good name and standing of the medical college in the whole country. Any affiliation with homeopathy would be a violation of the code of ethics of the American Medical Association. \* \* \* This written code of ethics is law unto the profession over the entire Union, and its violation would inevitably lead to the expulsion of the faculty and the graduates of the institution from every medical association or society in the country. We, the faculty and graduates, would be outcasts from the profession, and the diplomas would not be worth the parchment upon which they were written, as passports to admission to the medical profession. Our certificates of attendance would be worthless to the student desirous of attending lectures in any other college."

The faculty of 1867 evidently did not think that "to approve or reprove the action of the regents was no part of their duty." True, most true, circumstances have greatly changed since then, and after many years of self-respectful but self-denying opposition to charlatanry, the faculty have discovered the happy means of reconciling a submissive sense of duty with a humiliating but fruitful obedience to authority.

Respectfully,

A. SAGER.

## HOMEOPATHY—"AS YOU LIKE IT."

*Messrs. Editors:*

CAN you shed any light on some ways that are dark to a busy practitioner who has no microscope? We gentlemen of the rural districts are in danger of becoming badly mixed on the homeopathic question, through the efforts of the faculty to enlighten us, and are uncertain whether the trouble with the college is evolution or revolution. We are gravely informed in that "comedy of errors," the famous statement No. 1, that an unfortunate state of things has been inaugurated in the college, for which the faculty are in no wise responsible, yet hasten to rise and explain—that it is all right anyway, is even better than the old way, and that it is strange it had not been done before; that they have resisted similar "complications" for twenty years, yet accept terms of unconditional surrender to this, and give some boot in defending it, notwithstanding homeopathy is as absurd as ever, and its practitioners unworthy professional association; that the State Society did a wrong thing in proposing a mixed board of examiners to winnow out as many quacks of all kinds as possible, yet it is all right for the faculty to help hatch out a new brood; in short, that the whole arrangement was bad, was effected "during the absence of some of the faculty from the State, and in opposition to their well-known wishes"—yet they "expect to be sustained by all judicious physicians!"

The faculty do not seem to show to better advantage in the editorial capacity. In the November number of their journal they say that, "after the most careful and conscientious reflection, they came to see with *one accord* that the course which they have taken was the *only one* which they could, in justice to themselves and the profession, adopt and defend." "Moreover, it must be remembered that the policy of the faculty has been fully indorsed by the State Medical Society, and by almost every local society in the State." If it is not too much trouble, will they tell us *what societies?*

But in the December number they say, "though they wanted nothing to do in the remotest manner with what they regarded as absurdity, delusion or quackery," etc., yet they "can but approve this decision" (that is, of all those whose salaries are more than "only two hundred dollars," to hold on), "and believe, with Dr. Flint and others, that the result will show its wisdom." ("Wisdom is the principal thing, therefore get wisdom; and with all thy getting, get understanding.")



But "should the Legislature and the regents determine to give the homeopaths an entire faculty and another location, we shall not regret it." An "entire faculty!" Their modesty will be the death of the faculty yet.

But they ought to regret it, if, according to the November editor, they "are now and will continue to be fully sustained by the public sentiment of the profession," and that its "impartial verdict cannot fail to be unequivocally in favor of their conduct and motives." And what need of "peace" has a faculty that has "pursued its way" with such an "even tenor," and "displayed" (?) such "serenity and confidence?"

Besides, what necessity for breaking up the arrangement now, so long as the November editor assures us that, "Having strenuously resisted homeopathy from the first, and having kept it out of the University as long as it was possible to do so, when at last it had to be admitted, the faculty have taken every precaution to prevent its admission from having an injurious effect upon the interests of the profession at large." Thanks. We should not otherwise have been so sure of it.

We would suggest to the successive monthly editors of the journal to read its files. We cannot forbear quoting the editor for January, 1875, whose "autonomy" at that date apparently had not been "disturbed" by "complications." In speaking of the Jackson physicians' collecting association, he gave this sound advice: "We have no sympathy with an association made up of such heterogeneous constituents; even the plea of offensive and defensive alliance against a common evil does not justify it. The physician has no right to compromise the dignity of his profession by an association with illiterate and pretentious practitioners. The physicians of Jackson owe it to their brethren to withdraw at once from this unholy alliance."

We are informed that the Jackson physicians withdrew.

Would it not be well to repeat the advice for general effect.

It is not long since the faculty, in their university journal, favored educating the masses by popular lectures as a remedy for quackery, but now they seem to have changed their plan to educating homeopaths, and leave the masses in ignorance to think it all right.

To a man "up a tree," who looks "on this picture and on that," and then on t'other, it seems as if the faculty had read that homely old maxim, "First go ahead, then see if you are right." It is small credit to the faculty for them to say they have stood the brunt of opposing the introduction of homeopathy in the university for twenty years, if it were literally true, as that was their duty and their interest, though it will doubtless interest those gentlemen who have rendered efficient aid to relieve the faculty in their biennial scares during the sessions of the legislature, to see this acknowledgment of their services, some of whom were

working for the University when members of the present faculty must have been small boys.

The profession of the State have ever been ready to support the faculty in any and every effort for their mutual good, whether to resist homœopathy or to advance the standard of medical education—especially if it be a real advance—when it seemed acceptable; but the faculty as a whole apparently have not always desired assistance, and they have not encouraged voluntary aid. It is well known to the older members of the profession that some members of the faculty are seldom or ever seen at medical societies except when some influence is to be exerted, though they have been very successful in the business of teaching, making it profitable.

The query has been raised in this vicinity whether the prospect of an enlarged field for consultations thus opened, furnish any of the reasons which tend to reconcile the faculty to the situation, and to defend it with such zeal? But if that is the plan, would it not be well to have some general understanding?

The brave militia captain when brought face to face with the enemy observed to his company in ordering a retreat, "as I can't run very fast I'll start now!"

A prominent eclectic doctor of this county boasts that the Prof. of Surgery came to his aid in consultation; and his patient and their neighbors naturally think that eclectic practice must be all right, and that we regulars must have been very wrong in declining to meet this quack, who thus secures the double advantage of a consultation, and of using a professor in the university to strengthen him in his position, and at our expense.

We do not charge that the professor did this knowingly, but if not, it is inexcusable neglect in this age of telegraphs to have obtained information easily acquired, that works injury to rational medicine and those who try to practice it.

If this view of this case should seem so objectionable that the professor may claim that it was done ignorantly, what is the justification for knowingly teaching students—professedly irregular—who may consistently claim consultations at least in the practical branches taught them only by the regular faculty?

If this is a sample of the "younger blood of the medical department," promised us at the State society, and through the newspapers, let us go back to the old, or have transfusion of some better blood. Spare us any transmission of this.

M. D.

CALHOUN COUNTY, February 21, 1876.



## MORE OF HOMEOPATHY IN THE UNIVERSITY AS SEEN BY STUDENTS.

### *Editors Review:*

We had not intended to quite extinguish our class-mates in our reply in your January number, to their little statement in the November number of the *Peninsular Journal*. Much as they try to put a brave face on it, we happen to know that many of them would be glad to enter the profession under better auspices, but think their necessities compel them to submit to the exigencies of the circumstances under which they unwittingly find themselves. While some poor fellows who were tempted into the list of candidates for graduation, by the ease with which that terrible "preliminary examination" was passed, and who are not sure about the "final," are wondering, if they fail, whether homeopathic candidates of only equal attainments with themselves in the branches in which they are examined in common, can be prevented from graduating, providing they pass satisfactory examinations before their homeopathic professors? And if not how are the faculty to make "better homeopathic doctors," and thereby "benefit humanity." While our homeopathic half-brothers, good and ill, are feeling jubilant by reason of the "two strings to their bow," and are claiming, and apparently with good reason, that in cases of surgery, gynecology, and diseases of children, the faculty—and if they, why not the profession—cannot refuse to recognize and consult with them after furnishing them all the information they get on those "fundamental branches," as well as the certificates, by aid of which they obtain their diplomas.

We hope the friends of the old college, may yet be able to say truthfully, what it cannot now say, "no connection with the concern across the way," notwithstanding the recent assertion of a member of the literary faculty, in what purports to be an authentic history of the university in a popular magazine.

By the way, it is spoken of by older students and others as remarkable that in giving the names of the earlier faculties who aided Dr. Tappan in developing the university, though some are mentioned who could only have been connected with the University a year or two before Dr. Tappan's removal, the name of the venerable and distinguished Prof. Sager, one of the earliest members of any faculty, and one of the founders of the medical department, and one of the largest contributors to its museum, does not appear.

This significant omission by a homeopathic patron, together with the inaccuracy of the relations of the two colleges, seem to indicate one of the objects of the paper; and which seems also in keeping with much of the policy of the faculty and the university authorities, to influence the profession on professional topics by opinions of laymen, and appeals to the public.

The professor of surgery requested us to look in the November number of the *Journal* as we would find his views there editorially expressed. And by the way, the various "views" we have had, in the faculty statement, the explanations of different members of the faculty to the class, and the explanations of their explanations, followed by the faculty editorials of the *Journal*, are somewhat confusing.

The professor says: "The tide of public professional opinion has undoubtedly taken, as they always hoped and believed it would, a decidedly favorable turn." Small favors in the way of a "turn" seem to be thankfully received.

The discussion of the subject seems to drift naturally into nautical phraseology, perhaps because of the new water works, which it is suggested were erected to facilitate the "dilutions" for a homeopathic hospital.

But while their "Bark is on the Sea," we would remind the faculty that "There is a tide in the affairs (of colleges as) of men, which taken at the flood leads on to fortune, omitted," etc. We trust they will take advantage of the favorable turn "to tack"—not "give up"—"the ship," if they can keep its guns from doing service for the enemy, and don't have to fly but one flag. The old craft has a sound keel, and seems staunch enough when well manned and managed. But they should look out for barnacles. And if she were copper-bottomed and iron clad, with a revolving turret for the crew, she never could win honor between two fires, even if she kept afloat. But the best of ships may be overloaded, and just now her greatest need seems to be a "Plimsoll's line" painted on her hull, broad enough for even regents to see when they have freight enough. This, together with weather signals, the underwriters of the profession could insist on; and if disregarded by the skippers or owners, it is well that they should all be in the same boat together.

Though it would be sad if she should, having

"Stood the storm when waves were rough,  
Yet in a sunny hour fall off,  
Like ships that have gone down at sea,  
When heaven was all tranquillity."

Even "rats leave a sinking ship," students cannot be credited with less sagacity.

INDEPENDENT STUDENTS.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, February 19, 1876.



## COMMENTS ON SOME RECENT EDITORIALS IN THE PENINSULAR JOURNAL

ANN ARBOR, February 15, 1876.

*Editors of the Review :*

GENTLEMEN—It is only from a sense of duty that we beg the use of your columns to refute certain editorial statements that have appeared in some recent numbers of the *Peninsular Journal*. But the editorials of that journal are of a very doubtful paternity, since the dean of the faculty and the professor of surgery seem to be joint claimants of the honor, with the avowed editor. It is to be regretted that gentlemen occupying their position should deem it more indicative of moral courage, more consistent with professional dignity and honor, to conceal themselves behind the editorial shield, than to express their views openly over their own signatures. But, whether in this discreditable manner they desire to shirk the responsibility of their statements, or from perhaps a pardonable weakness they seek every opportunity either to defend their own delinquencies or to eke out the feeble, vacillating and equivocal laudation the voice of the profession has hitherto accorded them, they will probably find that temporary advantages thus gained are always ephemeral, and the recoil no less certain than fatal.

We are led to make these remarks in consequence of some statements in the December and January issues of the *Peninsular Journal*, seeking to impugn, by deliberate misrepresentation, our motives and conduct in tendering our resignation of the office of dean of the faculty.

The greater part of the editorial in the December number is now, we think, confessedly from the pen of the dean of the faculty, while the latter, from its intensely unfair and discreditable character, may be presumed to owe its paternity to the avowed editor; yet, presuming that his intimate relation to the faculty may have resulted in precocious development, perhaps we should humbly accept the *ex cathedra* lessons on ethics he condescends to read us, although the first semi-decade of his professional life is barely turned.

On re-perusing it, we find in the dean's part of the editorial of the December issue of the *Journal*, some passages that were previously overlooked, and which we desire to bring to the notice of your readers. He asserts that "two of the veteran professors (Drs. Palmer and Ford) were out of the State at the time of these

occurrences, and knew nothing of the matter until all these arrangements were accomplished." In addition to the evidence before adduced, showing that these two "veteran professors" were present at a meeting of the faculty about the middle of March, when a proposition was made also by a "veteran professor," and supported by Dr. Ford, we would refer to the action of the Board of Regents, on the 17th of February (during term time), sitting with open doors, and generally attended by some members of the faculty, proving conclusively that some action of the Legislature was impending, and which was encouraged by the Board of Regents, Dr. Rynd acting as chief fogleman. We quote from the minutes of that meeting of the Board, viz: Regent Rynd "reported that the committee on the medical department, to whom were referred various papers on the subject of homeopathy, and also a copy of a proposed Senate bill, asking an appropriation of five thousand dollars for the establishment of such department, \* \* \* would respectfully report, that we will, if so desired by the Legislature, manage the affairs of such homeopathic college as may be established, to the best of our ability," etc. "In this connection we feel it incumbent upon us, however, to suggest that the sum asked for is more than sufficient to pay the salaries of two professors during a four months' course, as contemplated in the bill," etc.

With these facts before them, we leave it to the judgment of the profession, whether these "veteran professors" were as ignorant of what was impending, and likely to be effected, as they claim—whether, in fact, this action of the Board of Regents did not foreshadow events in harmony with the action, which actually transpired but a few weeks later.

Furthermore, that the action of the regents, by which "all was completely accomplished," was not wholly unlooked for by the dean, we infer from the following extract from a letter written from Maine on the 15th day of May, just three days after the enactment of the plan of organization of the homeopathic attachment:

"I can but feel that there has fallen upon the University the deep disgrace we have for the last twenty years labored to avert, and, from some expressions I heard before leaving home (20th April—a few days before the legislative act was passed), I fear by the full consent, and, probably, connivance of some who ought to have had more sense and principle, and who should be held to all the responsibility which was assumed by the faculty and the profession.

"While I look with much apprehension to the future, for the honor of the University and the success of the medical department, I shall do what I can to preserve both, while I shall not disregard my own professional honor and consistency."

Does it not seem evident from these facts and the foregoing



statement, that the dean not only had foreknowledge of the coming events, but had made up his mind thus early to accept the situation, and would, if he had been present at the meeting of the committee of the board, like the other members of the faculty, have "interposed no serious objections."

Would it be uncharitable to assume that the connivance above alluded to, had reference to the two members of the faculty who at the March meeting of the faculty had advocated the admission of homeopathy into the medical department of the university?

Again in the same editorial, the dean seeks to cast some implied censure upon the writer for having "made no protest, offered no suggestion, said not a word until long after all was completely accomplished, and certainly, he of all others was not the man to complain as he has done that no protest was upon the records of the faculty."

We have shown in the February number of the REVIEW, that these statements were wholly without foundation, in fact, that prior to the enactment of the "homeopathic plan" by the board, we had urged our objection to the faculty, and offered them for publication by the secular press a week previous to the meeting of the regents, that at the earliest possible moment they were offered to the *Peninsular Journal* and published therein, and that for several weeks prior to the complete accomplishment of this matter we had tendered our resignation, setting forth our objections in full to the plan of organization. We may add that in a friendly and courteous interview with the president, about a week after the meeting of the board (spoken of by the courteous? editor of the *Journal*, as the interview "at which occurred the *injudicious and questionably proper action of a representative of the board*, who disagreeing with Dr. Sager, undertook to dictate to him"), we intimated our intention of resigning. This the president kindly requested me not to do, saying it might embarrass the action of the board at the present critical juncture. To this we frankly replied that if by so doing we could prevent the final consummation of the plan, it would be the most valuable service we had ever been able to render the University. We need not add that neither the character of president Angell, nor the occasion, nor our relations to him, would for a moment justify even the suspicion of any attempt to dictate to me as to my proper line of duty. He merely expressed the apprehension that the publication of my protest might bring me into unfriendly relations with the Board of Regents.

Moreover, let it be borne in mind that the practical adoption of the homeopathic plan would in no wise have directly affected us as dean of the faculty. We should not have been called upon to take any part in the teaching, examining or certifying to the qualifications of a class of students known as candidates for the homeopathic degree, as do the members of the teaching faculty. We should not have been called upon even to recognize their

existence as a part of our official duty, but we were unwilling to occupy a position as the official head of a faculty that chose to recognize homeopathy, or that implied an approval of the plan of organization of this or any other form of charlatany.

In reference to our motives for offering our resignation, it may be desirable to place on record the unsolicited opinions of at least two of the medical faculty. In writing to a friend, Dr. Dunster says: "I am inclined to think Dr. Sager will resign his deanship and have nothing to do with it, for he is unquestionably conscientious in his belief about it; he thinks it is wrong to stay in an institution where such heresy is admitted."

And from Dean Palmer, "I regret exceedingly the state of things in the University, and that you have felt the necessity of resigning your position. Still I have no word of censure—only regret."

In the issue of December 11th of the *N. Y. Medical Record* we find an indignant denial by Prof. Palmer of a charge previously published in the *Record*, that he (Dr. Palmer) had said, "with Dr. Sager it was a question of only two hundred dollars, while with us (the faculty), it was a question of eighteen hundred dollars," yet in the dean's part of the editorial of December of the *Peninsular Journal*, we find the idea substantially reproduced: "All excepting Dr. Sager, who two years before had retired from active duty as a teacher, and received a salary of only two hundred dollars," thus obviously suggesting the other term of the comparison, the eighteen hundred or two thousand dollars salary for a six months course of the teaching faculty, showing that ideas that lie near the surface are apt to crop out from very slight causes of denudation.

But in view of the nearly unanimous expression of disapprobation of the course of the faculty by the professional press, and the vacillating course of the small number of journals that feebly support them, as well as from other indications that crop out here and there, we suspect the faculty will make some effort at this late hour, and under the stress of adverse professional opinion, to induce the Board of Regents to back down from the imperious and dictatorial attitude, assumed by the leader in this matter, Dr. Rynd (himself perhaps not without anticipated personal reasons), and an attempt may be made to repeal some of the slighter objectionable features in the hope that the profession will be deceived by some slight concession—while still leaving the faculty in the humiliating position of "adjunct professors" of a college of homeopathy, and requiring them as heretofore, to furnish the major part of the curriculum of study and credentials of the homeopathic candidate for the degree of homeopathic doctor of medicine.

Respectfully,

A. SAGER.